UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/324,568 | 06/02/1999 | ADRIAN O. MANCINI | 0500.01327 | 1726 |

7590    03/24/2003

CHRISTOPHER J. RECKAMP
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL   606060229

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| ZAND, KAMBIZ |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2132 | 3 |

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/324,568 | MANCINI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Kambiz Zand | 2132 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 June 1999</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 June 1999</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

　　If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

　　a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

1.    **Claims 1-21** have been examined.

### Drawings

2.    New formal drawings are required in this application because original drawings

by the applicant were objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

Please see attached PTO-948.

3.    The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description

Page 5 lines 6, 8 and 9 item "14a"; page 11, line 28-page 12, line 20 items "30", "12",

"32", "38", "44", "46", "40" and "18". Correction is required.

4.    The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4)

because reference character "20a" in fig. 2 has been used to designate both

connections to repository 18 and certificate verifier 36 in contrast with fig.2 wherein it

appears that 20a connections to item "18" is not the same connection to item "36".

Correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.    The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.      **Claims 5-6, 8, 13-14, 17-19 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7.      **Claims 5, 6, 17, 19 and 20** recites the limitation "the trust anchor modification data" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Also note "a trust anchor modification data certificate issuer" in the claim 5 does not provide sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

**Claims 8 and 13** recites the limitation "subordinate authority memory" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### Claim Objections

8.      **Claims 1-21** are objected to because of the following informalities:  Examiner suggests insertion of "a" before "subordinate authorities" in line 4 of claims 1, 9 and 15; "an" before "inter trusted" in line 5 of claims 1 and 15, in line 7 of claim 9; "a" before "dynamically" in line 6 of claim 1, in line 8 of claim 9 and in line 5 of claim 15. Appropriate correction is requested.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

9.      The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.     **Claims 1-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abadi

et al (5,315,657 A).

**As per claims 1 and 15** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach an information security system

and method comprising: a plurality of trusted authorities configurable in a rooted

hierarchical structure (see col.7, lines 40-47) including at least one of the trusted

authorities being a superior authority (see col.7, lines 27-29) and at least one of the

trusted authorities being a subordinate authorities (see col.7, lines 45-48); and the

superior authority operative to generate an inter trust authority modification data to a

dynamically vary validation starting authorities among the subordinate authorities (see

66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 wherein an inter trust between the different certificate

authorities is being implemented by cross-certifying each other wherein their root is a

common ancestor). Also see col.6, lines 58-68; col.7, lines 1-28; col.8, lines 55-68 and

col.9 for more detailed inter trust between different authorities, their certification and verification.

**As per claims 2 and 16** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1 and 15 wherein at least one of the subordinate authorities includes a certificate issuer operatively responsive to the inter trusted authority modification data for issuing certificate for at least one subscriber based on the inter trusted authority modification data (see col.7, lines 48-65 and col.col.8, lines 12-44 wherein the request for certification that is the modified data is being certified by inter trust authorities by issuing a signed certificate).

**As per claims 3 and 17** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1 and 15 wherein at least one of the subordinate authorities includes a subscriber trust anchor specifier, operatively responsive to the inter trusted authority modification data, that generates trust modification data for a plurality of subscribers (see col.9, lines 24-54).

**Claim 9** is combination of claims 1-3 and therefore Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach all limitation of the claim as being rejected based on rejection of claims 1-3 above.

**As per claims 4, 10 and 18** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 3, 9 and 17 wherein the trust anchor modification data includes subordinate trust

anchor data representing at least one trust anchor different from a local trust authority

(see col.66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 wherein one of the user is not certified by a local trust

authority and that's why cross certification is being done between them in order to

create a trust).

**As per claims 5, 11 and 19** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of

claims 1, 10 and 15 wherein the superior authority includes a trust anchor modification

data certificate issuer that provides the trust anchor modification data as a signed data

structure for the subordinate authorities (see col.7, lines 50-53 and col.8, lines 42-44

wherein all new certification are signed representing signed data structure).

**As per claims 6, 12 and 20** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of

claims 1, 9 and 15 wherein the trust anchor modification data includes data representing

at least one of: scope of certification data, subordinate authority cross-certification

allowance data, subordinate authority certification rule data, subordinate authority

password rule data, subscriber trust anchor rule data and subscriber password rule

data, certificate expiry policy, subscriber algorithm policy, and policy control message

data (see as an example col.7, lines 66-68 and col.8, lines 1-2 for cross-certification

data; col.8, lines 45-52 for certificate expiry policy).

**As per claims 7 and 13** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1 and 12 wherein one of the trusted authorities is a root authority (see col.7, lines 53-55).

**As per claims 8, 14 and 21** Abadi et al (5,315,657 A) teach the system and method of claims 1, 13 and 15 including subordinate authority memory containing data representing validation starting authority data, wherein the data is stored in response to receiving the inter trusted authority trust modification (see col.8, lines 42-44; col.10, lines 7-24).

## Conclusion

11.    The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S.Patent No. US (5,958,050 A) teach trusted delegation system.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,532,451 B1)) teach nesting strong loader apparatus and method.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,167,521 A) teach securely downloading and executing code from mutually auspicious authorities.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,189,103 B1) teach authority delegation with secure operating system queues.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,105,027 A) teach techniques for eliminating redundant access checking by access filters.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,408,336 B1) teach distributed administration of access to information.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,256,741 B1) teach specifying security protocols and policy constraints in distributed systems.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,304,973 B1) teach multi-level security network.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,006,332 A) teach rights management system for digital media.

U.S.Patent No. US (6,304,974 B1) teach method and apparatus for managing trusted certificates.

12.    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (703) 306-4169. The examiner can normally reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on  (703) 305-1830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

After-Final           (703) 746-7238

Official              (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/Draft    (703) 746-7240

Kambiz Zand

03/17/03

GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100